REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated December 15, 2004 and the Advisory Action dated April 21, 2004 have been considered. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Summary of the Final Office Action and the Advisory Action

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,963,521 to Nagashima et al. (hereinafter "Nagashima").

Applicants note that page 2, section 4 of the Final Office Action does not refer to dependent claim 6 as being rejected. However, claim 6 is indicated as rejected at page 1 of the Office Action (e.g., at item 6 of the PTOL-326 form). Also, claim 6 is discussed at page 4, section 9 of the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants note that while it appears that dependent claim 6 has also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the Office Action is not precise in this regard.

In the Advisory Action dated April 21, 2004, the Examiner indicated that a Response and Request for Reconsideration filed by Applicants on April 12, 2004 has been considered but does not place the application in condition for allowance. The Advisory Action did not clarify the issue discussed in the preceding paragraph regarding which claims were currently rejected in this application. Instead, the Advisory Action noted in Section 7 of page 1 of the PTOL-303 Form that for purposes of appeal, the status of the claims is as follows: "Claim(s) rejected: 1-7." Applicants respectfully submit for clarification of the record that only claims 1-6 were pending at the time the Advisory Action was issued.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants cancel claims 1-6 without prejudice or disclaimer and add new claims 7-12 by this amendment to differently describe the invention. Accordingly, claims 7-12 are currently pending.

All Subject Matter Is Allowable

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,963,521 to Nagashima et al. (hereinafter "Nagashima"). Claims 1-6 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) have been rendered moot. Claims 7-12 have been newly-added to differently describe the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that these new claims are in condition for allowance.

Newly-added independent claim 7 recites an information reproducing apparatus for expanding compressed information recorded on an information recording medium by one of a plurality of different compression methods, and outputs reproduced information based on the expanded information. The information reproducing apparatus combination recited in newly-added claim 7 includes "a reading device for reading compressed information recorded on said recording medium; a memory controller for writing the compressed information read by said reading device into a memory, reading the compressed information written in said memory in the order of writing; an expander for expanding the information read by said memory controller; and a judging device for determining which of the plurality of compression methods is used as a compression method of the compressed information read by said reading device, wherein said memory controller starts to read the compressed information from said memory when an amount

of the compressed information written into said memory reaches a first storage information amount corresponding to a compression method determined by the judging device."

Applicants respectfully submit that Nagashima does not meet the limitations of the newly-presented independent claim 7. For example, Nagashima states, at col. 7, lines 40-44 that "the reproduced data written in the burst fashion in the memory 22 at the transmission rate of 75 sectors/second are read out continuously at the regular transmission rate of 18.75 sectors/second for the level B stereo mode." Applicants respectfully submit that Nagashima does not teach or suggest at least that a memory controller starts to read compressed information from a memory when an amount of the compressed information written into the memory reaches a first storage information amount corresponding to a compression method determined by a judging device, in the manner recited in independent claim 7 of the instant application.

As discussed above, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because Nagashima does not teach or suggest each feature of newly-added independent claim 7. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that newly-added dependent claims 8-12 are allowable at least because of the dependence from independent claim 7, and the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should there remain any questions or

comments regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

Paul A. Fournier
Registration No. 41,023

Dated: June 14, 2004

Customer No.: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001